

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05235 311456Z

43

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 SS-20 NSC-10 OIC-04 ACDA-19 OMB-01 IO-14 DRC-01

EA-11 MC-02 EB-11 /174 W

----- 125038

R 311410Z OCT 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2440

SECDEF

S E C R E T USNATO 5235

E.O. 11652: GDS 12-31-81

TAGS: MCAP, NATO

SUBJ: EWG MEETING OCT 30 ON BASIC ISSUES OF DEFENSE PLANNING

TEXT OF STATEMENT ON ANTI-ARMOR CIRCULATED BY US REP AT EWG  
MEETING OCTOBER 30 FOLLOWS:

BEGIN TEXT:

STATEMENT BY THE UNITED STATES ON NATO ANTI-TANK PROGRAM

THE MIDDLE EAST WAR TENTATIVELY CONFIRMS VALUE OF ANTI-TANK WEAPONS. IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, THE U.S. AND REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM FORCES HAD GREAT SUCCESS AGAINST NORTH VIETNAMESE TANKS, WITH WEAPONS AS DIVERSE AS M-48 MEDIUM TANK, LAW AND TOW. UH-1 MOUNTED TOW HIT ON 26 OF 27 FIRINGS IN VIETNAM. FIELD SIMULATIONS OF TOW/M-113 VERSUS TANKS SHOW ABOUT A 3-TO-1 EXCHANGE RATIO IN FAVOR OF TOW (CONFIRMED BY GERMAN STUDIES PRESENTED TO NATO DEFENSE PLANNING WORKSHOP). TOW-EQUIPPED HELICOPTERS AGAINST LEOPARD AND VULCAN IN SIMULATIONS IN GERMANY HAD A FAVORABLE EXCHANGE RATIO OF 18 TO 1. WE NOTE RECENT AC/243 PANEL VII REPORT THAT CONCLUDED THAT NATO COULD OFFSET THE ADVANTAGE OF WARSAW PACT IN NUMBERS OF TANKS BY INCREASING DENSITY OF HEAVY

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05235 311456Z

ANTI-TANK WEAPONS (HAW) AND MEDIUM ANTI-TANK WEAPONS (MAW) AND BY TAKING OTHER MEASURES OF RELATIVELY LOW COST.

THE U.S. RECOMMENDS THAT NATO CONSIDER LARGE, DEFINITE

PROGRAMS FOR INFANTRY HEAVY AND MEDIUM ANTI-TANK WEAPONS. A TWO-PHASE PROGRAM IS SUGGESTED BELOW. DISCUSSION AND FIGURES APPLY TO CENTER REGION, FOR WHICH WE HAVE DATA. WE DO NOT HAVE ADEQUATE DATA FOR OTHER REGIONS, BUT RECOMMENDATIONS PROBABLY WILL APPLY THERE AS WELL. IN THE FIRST PHASE, ALL OLDER, LESS CAPABLE WEAPONS SHOULD BE REPLACED ON A ONE-FOR-ONE BASIS BY NEWER, MORE CAPABLE WEAPONS; PHASE ONE WOULD INVOLVE:

A. RETENTION OF EXISTING FULLY CAPABLE WEAPONS (E.G., TOW, JPZ KANONE, M551);

B. REPLACEMENT OF OBSOLESCEMENT HEAVY INFANTRY WEAPONS (E.G., SS-11, 106RR) WITH A MODERN HEAVY ANTI-TANK WEAPON ON A ONE-FOR-ONE BASIS;

C. REPLACEMENT OF OBSOLESCEMENT MEDIUM WEAPONS (E.G., KARL GUSTAV, 90MM RR) WITH A MODERN MEDIUM ANTI-TANK WEAPON ON A ONE-FOR-ONE BASIS.

THESE STEPS WOULD RESULT IN MORE THAN 14,000 CAPABLE WEAPONS IN PLACE IN THE CENTER REGION.

IN THE SECOND PHASE, THE NUMBER OF WEAPONS IN MANEUVER AND RECONNAISSANCE UNITS WOULD BE INCREASED. THE U.S. ARMY, FOR EXAMPLE, WILL REPLACE THREE ENTAC, SIX 106MM RR, AND 18 90 MM RR PER INFANTRY BATTALION WITH 18 TOW AND 27 DRAGON. THE GREATER THAN ONE-FOR-ONE REPLACEMENT PERMITS A LARGER FRACTION OF THE AVAILABLE TANK FLEET TO BE USED AS THE STRIKE FORCE IN THE MOBILE DEFENSE.

THE NUMBERS OF U.S. ANTI-TANK WEAPONS REFLECT TAILORING TO THE PROJECTED STRUCTURE OF U.S. FORCES AND TO THE THREAT FORECAST FOR THE LATE 1970'S. SINCE THESE FACTORS WILL DIFFER FOR VARIOUS NATIONS, THE RATIO OF HEAVY ANTI-TANK WEAPONS TO MEDIUM ANTI-TANK WEAPONS MIGHT WELL BE DIFFERENT. FURTHER DETAILED NATIONAL STUDIES FOR EACH ARMY WOULD BE REQUIRED IN THIS SECOND PHASE.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05235 311456Z

THE UNITED STATES SUGGESTS THE FOLLOWING EWG RECOMMENDATIONS TO MINISTERS IN DECEMBER:

A. A PHASE ONE ANTI-TANK PROGRAM REPLACING OLDER WEAPONS ON A ONE-FOR-ONE BASIS TO BE FULLY PROGRAMMED BY END-1974.

B. A PHASE TWO PROGRAM INCREASING DENSITIES OF WEAPONS IN MANEUVER AND RECONNAISSANCE BATTALIONS BASED ON NATIONAL STUDIES.

C. BOTH PHASES TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY END-1977.

D. CONTINUE PRESENT TANK, BARRIER AND ATTACK HELICOPTER  
PROGRAMS.

E. PROVIDE A SUITABLE MIX OF AIR ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS, AS  
MAY BE DETERMINED IN THE PLANNING FOR WAR RESERVE  
STOCKS. END TEXT  
MCAULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 02 APR 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 31 OCT 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973NATO05235  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS 12-31-81  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19731064/abqcecyf.tel  
**Line Count:** 118  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 17 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <17-Aug-2001 by elyme>; APPROVED <26-Sep-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** EWG MEETING OCT 30 ON BASIC ISSUES OF DEFENSE PLANNING  
**TAGS:** MCAP, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
**SECDEF**  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005